



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/551,780 | 11/29/2006 | Motoharu Seiki | P28604 | 5607 |
| 7055 7590 08/12/2009 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191 | | | | |
| EXAMINER HALVORSON, MARK | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1642 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/12/2009 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/551,780

Applicant(s)

SEIKI ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Halvorson

Art Unit

1642

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mark Halvorson.

(3) _____.

(2) Sean Myers-Payne.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 August 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-32.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bednarski et al, Kitagawa et al and Zaplinsky et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' counsel explained why the 35 USC 112 written description requirement was satisfied. Applicants' counsel pointed out miscalculation in the DSPE-PEG-mal to DSPE-PEG ratio cited from Zaplinsky et al. Possible amendments and evidence to advance prosecution were discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mark Halvorson/
Examiner, Art Unit 1642

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Interview Summary

Paper No. 20090807